

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/741,265	10/30/1996	HARDISH SINGH	11611.4US01	1018
7	590 03/26/2003			
CRAWFORD PLLC 1270 NOTHLAND DR. SUITE 390			EXAMINER	
			YAO, KWANG BIN	
MENDOTA H	IEGHT'S, MN 55120		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2664	26
			DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003	26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Annication No.	Applicant(s)				
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	08/741,265	SINGH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication and	Kwang B. Yao	2664	_			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of vill apply and will expire SIX (6) Modes, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	<b>.</b>			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 J	<u>luly 2001</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated in accordance with the practice under			s			
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 16-23</u> is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 16-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers  OVE The specification is objected to by the Evamine	r					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received ir	Application No				
Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But     See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	).				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
<ul> <li>a)  The translation of the foreign language pro</li> <li>15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting</li> </ul>	• •					
Attachment(s)	, , ,	•••				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice	ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2664

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal**

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 7/16/01, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
  - (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2664

3. Claims 1, 4 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by White et al. (US 6,069,890).

Regarding claims 1, 16 and 17, White et al. discloses a system for providing telephone type services comprising the following features: in Fig. 2, telephone 56; central office 50 coupled to telephone 56, and configured and arranged to receive audio information designating the number of telephone 58; the central office 50 including a first output to PSTN via link 54, and a second output to Internet 84 via link 76, Internet module 72 and link 86; central office 50 for analyzing the dialing digits from telephone 56, and for determining if there is a prefix \*82 in the dialing digits, and for establishing a regular telephone call via PSTN 57 if there isn't any prefix, and for establishing an Internet call via Internet 84 if there is a prefix \*82 in the dialing digits and communicating the audio information in accordance with the TCP/IP protocols. See column 5, line 64 to column 6, line 5.

Regarding claim 4, White et al. discloses the following features: as depicted in Fig. 5, step 140, gateway router for assembling the audio information signals into TCP/IP packet.

Regarding claims 18 and 21, White et al. discloses the following features: the system determines whether the call is to be routed to the PSTN or Internet by comparing the dialing digits to the phone number/IP address information in the Internet address database 112 in Fig. 4; this process is without the intervention of either the calling party or the called party, and is without any further information from calling party besides the dialing digits. See column 5, lines 52-55; column 9, lines 11-29.

Regarding claims 19 and 22, White et al. discloses the following features: the system determines whether the call is to be routed to the PSTN or Internet by detecting \*82 received as

part of dialing digits, the \*82 can be referred as the number of an Internet module 72 in Fig. 2 because the system will route the call to Internet if there is the detected code of \*82; this process is without the intervention of either the calling party or the called party, and is without any further information from calling party besides the dialing digits. See column 5, lines 52-55; column 6, lines 43-56.

Page 4

Regarding claims 20 and 23, White et al. discloses the following features: the system determines whether the call is to be routed to the PSTN or Internet by comparing the dialing digits to a telephone number stored in the Internet address database 112 in Fig. 4; this process is without the intervention of either the calling party or the called party, and is without any further information from calling party besides the dialing digits. See column 5, lines 52-55; column 9, lines 11-29, step 136 of Fig. 5.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all 4. obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2664

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,069,890) in view of Kuthyar et al. (US 5,909,431), Shinohara et al. (US 5,351,237).

White et al. discloses the claimed limitations set forth. White et al. does not disclose the features of: RAS standard gatekeeper protocol, Q.931 standard Internet call protocol, H.245 standard end-to-end protocol; RTP standard protocol.

Kuthyar et al. discloses a real time multimedia service in a hybrid network comprising the following the features: system control entity 106 in Fig. 3 using RAS standard gatekeeper protocol; entity H.225.0/RTP 108 using standard real time transfer protocol. See column 4, line 67 to column 5, line 2. Kuthyar et al. discloses the features of using H.245 protocol, see column 5, line 64-67.

Shinohara et al. discloses a network system comprising the following features: DCH call control section 333 in Fig. 2 using Q.931 standard call control protocol. See column 4, lines 39-41.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of White et al., by using the standard protocols, as taught by Kuthyar et al., and Shinohara et al., in order to take advantage of well developed and globally recognized standard protocols.

6. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,069,890) in view of Schulzrinne et al. (RFC 1889).

Art Unit: 2664

White et al. discloses the claimed limitations set forth. White et al. does not disclose the features of: a standard quality of service protocol for gathering QoS statistics regarding packetized information; monitoring QoS statistics to adaptively control a rate which audio information is transferred. Schulzrinne et al. discloses the following features in RFC 1889: a standard quality of service protocol for gathering QoS statistics regarding packetized information; monitoring QoS statistics to adaptively control a rate which audio information is transferred. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of White et al, by using the features, as taught by Schulzrinne et al., in order to reduce the possibility of network congestion.

7. Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,069,890) in view of Kuthyar et al. (US 5,909,431), and Shinohara et al. (US 5,351,237) as applied to claims 1, 4 and 5 above, and further in view of Schulzrinne et al. (RFC 1889).

White et al., Kuthyar et al., Shinohara et al. disclose the claimed limitations set forth.

However, they do not disclose the features of: a standard quality of service protocol for gathering QoS statistics regarding packetized information; standard quality of service protocol using standard real time transfer control protocol RTCP; monitoring RTCP information to adaptively control a rate which audio information is transferred. Schulzrinne et al. discloses the following features in RFC 1889: a standard quality of service protocol for gathering QoS statistics regarding packetized information; standard quality of service protocol using standard real time transfer control protocol RTCP; monitoring RTCP information to adaptively control a rate which audio information is transferred. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

Art Unit: 2664

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of White et al.,

Kuthyar et al., and Shinohara et al., by using the features, as taught by Schulzrinne et al., in order

to reduce the possibility of network congestion.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kwang B. Yao whose telephone number is 703-308-7583. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 703-305-4366. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular

communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KWANG BIN YAO

Dollar!

Kwang B. Yao 2

March 20, 2003

Page 7